

proposals recommended by the constitutional convention, for changing the constitution. Up to that point in section 10.03, the entire section relates to the procedures, internal procedures of the convention, and for the calling of a constitutional convention.

The process of constitutional amendment is detailed in section 10.02. In that section it is clear that there are two methods by which an amendment may be proposed. One is by adoption of a proposed constitutional amendment by three-fifths of all members of the General Assembly, and second, by the affirmative vote of all members of the constitutional convention.

That section then goes on to detail the procedure by which such a proposed constitutional amendment is to be submitted to the voters. I think that the last sentence of section 10.03 is unclear and poses certain questions as to what a proposal is for changing the constitution that may or may not be different from an amendment of the constitution under section 10.02.

I would believe that what is intended by the last sentence of section 10.03 is in effect to incorporate by reference the provisions of section 10.02, but if that is the purpose, it does not do so in its entirety because it does not provide the vote by which such a proposal must be adopted by the constitutional convention. If you call an amendment a proposal, it is unclear whether section 10.02 would apply.

It also does not carry into section 10.03 the last sentence of section 10.02 which provides for an effective date of an amendment. There would seem to be some doubt as to what the effective date would be and whether the "unless otherwise provided" language of section 10.02 applies to an amendment, which would be called a proposal if it were submitted to the voters under the last section of 10.03.

I do not think there is any proposal for changing the constitution which is not an amendment. Therefore, I submit that this sentence in 10.03, which up to that point deals just with the calling of the Constitutional Convention and its internal organization, this sentence should be deleted. We should leave intact the language of section 10.02 which sets forth procedures that thus far we have felt necessary for submission of such a proposed amendment, whether it be an amendment of one section or several sections, or whether it be an amendment which would substitute the entire new constitution for the present constitution.

I respectfully urge you support this amendment and delete this last confusing sentence to section 10.03.

THE PRESIDENT: Delegate Boyer.

DELEGATE BOYER: Mr. President, I am frankly a little confused about the intent of this amendment. My understanding is that the amendment, I imagine we are talking about English words here — the definition of words, is a change of any proposal, as we have been doing here. The proposal, however, is broader than the amendment. Any proposal recommended by the Convention, a recommendation to change the constitution, has to be approved in some manner or other.

The General Provisions Committee and Style Committee have agreed that any proposal for recommended change in the constitution should be approved by the same manner in which an amendment to the constitution is approved.

Frankly, we prefer the wording in this recommendation to you, not the wording of the amendment. For some reason or other, I cannot quite grasp the thread of thought of Delegate Marion's proposal, this amendment here, to take out the verbiage in this particular section. We would prefer to keep it in there as the Style Committee has suggested.

THE PRESIDENT: Delegate Mentzer.

DELEGATE MENTZER: Mr. President, I cannot see the distinction that Delegate Boyer does between proposal of the Convention and amendment. In this body we often pay lip service to the ideal of a more concise constitution, and we often get away from that goal. Here we have an opportunity to put this ideal into practice and to do no violence to the substance of the provisions.

The treatment of amendments proposed either by the General Assembly or by a constitutional convention is fully covered in section 10.02. It does not have to be repeated in 10.03. I would urge support of this amendment.

THE PRESIDENT: Is there any further discussion?

At the risk of — Delegate Gleason.

DELEGATE GLEASON: Mr. President, I plead for a little clarification of not only the amendment, but also the last sentence in section 10.03. I gather what Delegate Marion is saying is that by using the word "proposal" rather than "amendment", and